

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY**

1 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)  
 MJacobs@mofo.com  
 2 ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ (CA SBN 121490)  
 AGonzalez@mofo.com  
 3 ERIC A. TATE (CA SBN 178719)  
 ETate@mofo.com  
 4 RUDY Y. KIM (CA SBN 199426)  
 RKim@mofo.com  
 5 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 425 Market Street  
 6 San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
 Telephone: 415.268.7000  
 7 Facsimile: 415.268.7522

8 Attorneys for Defendants  
 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
 9 OTTOMOTTO LLC, and OTTO TRUCKING LLC

10 KAREN L. DUNN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 kdunn@bsflp.com  
 11 HAMISH P.M. HUME (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 hhume@bsflp.com  
 12 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
 1401 New York Avenue, N.W.  
 13 Washington DC 20005  
 Telephone: 202.237.2727  
 14 Facsimile: 202.237.6131

15 Attorneys for Defendants  
 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
 16 and OTTOMOTTO LLC

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 19 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

20 WAYMO LLC,  
 21 Plaintiff,  
 22 v.  
 23 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
 24 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,  
 25 Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF  
 JAMES HASLIM IN SUPPORT OF  
 DEFENDANTS' SUR-REPLY TO  
 PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S MOTION  
 FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Date: May 3, 2017  
 Time: 7:30 a.m.  
 Ctrm: 8, 19th Floor  
 Judge: The Honorable William Alsup

Trial Date: October 2, 2017

**REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SUBMITTED UNDER SEAL**

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

1 I, James Haslim, declare as follows:


2 1. I am a Senior Manager, Engineering for the Advanced Technologies Group at  
3 Uber Technologies, Inc. (“Uber”) as of January 2017. I understand that Waymo has filed a  
4 lawsuit against Uber, Ottomotto LLC (“Otto”) and Otto Trucking LLC in the U.S. District Court  
5 for the Northern District of California. I submit this supplemental declaration in support of  
6 Defendants’ Sur-Reply to Waymo LLC’s (“Waymo”) Motion for Preliminary Injunction. I have  
7 personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called to testify as a witness,  
8 could and would do so competently.

9 **The Spider Project**

10 2. As stated in my original declaration, I joined Otto in May 2016 as Senior  
11 Mechanical Engineer and LiDAR lead, after Otto completed its acquisition of Tyto LIDAR LLC  
12 (“Tyto”). I was tasked with leading the team at Otto in developing a light detecting and ranging  
13 (LiDAR) solution for autonomous trucks. Shortly after I joined Otto, my team began working on  
14 a fiber-based LiDAR project intended for autonomous trucks. This project was known as the  
15 “Spider” project. The Spider project sought to leverage a pre-existing LiDAR sensor (known as  
16 “Owl”) that had been developed at Tyto beginning in 2012. Tyto’s Owl device was a mapping  
17 LiDAR sensor that used a single fiber laser. The Spider project was never completed and my  
18 team abandoned the Spider project to work on a very different LiDAR design (called “Fuji”) in  
19 late October 2016. Prior to abandoning the Spider project, we built a few components for testing  
20 purposes, but we never completely assembled these parts, and we never built all of the  
21 components needed for functional prototype, much less a complete LiDAR device. Thus, Spider  
22 was never made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported, and there are no plans to revive the  
23 abandoned Spider project.

24 3. The design concept for the Spider project was a LiDAR sensor with eight optical  
25 cavities, eight fiber lasers having a wavelength of approximately 1550 nanometers, and sixteen  
26 optical lenses (with each optical cavity having two optical lenses). The Spider design was  
27 intended to emit 3.2 million points or beams per second. Figure 1A and 1B, below, are true and  
28

1 correct computer aided design (CAD) drawings of the Spider design. Figure 1A shows a  
2 perspective view of the design, and Figure 1B shows a top view of the design:



13 4. After Uber acquired Otto in August 2016, I continued to lead my team's efforts on  
14 the Spider project until we pivoted to the Fuji project in late October 2016. Although Spider was  
15 intended to have eight optical cavities, our team only built a single optical cavity for testing  
16 purposes before the Spider project was abandoned. Figure 2.A, below is a true and correct photo  
17 of the test Spider optical cavity. Figure 2.B, below, is a true and correct annotated CAD drawing  
18 of a cross-sectional side view of an optical cavity design for Spider.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY




Figure 2.A





Figure 2.B

5. The Spider design included eight fiber lasers, each of which was split into eight “transmit fibers” to create a total of 64 transmit channels. Each cavity had eight transmit fibers—a single transmit fiber from each of the eight fiber lasers. Spider did not use any printed circuit boards (PCB) for positioning transmit fibers within a cavity. Rather, the transmit fibers were mounted into ceramic sleeves or ferrules which were bonded into holes drilled through a metal plate. Each cavity also had a flat mirror with a large hole to allow the light emitted from the transmit fibers to travel straight through the hole in the mirror, through two separate collimating lenses (an interior lens and an exterior lens) and into the environment.

6. Each optical cavity had two optical lenses. Figures 3.A and 3.B show true and correct schematics of the two optical lenses for each Spider cavity. Figure 3.A shows the schematic of the interior lens, i.e., the lens closest to the transmit fibers, and Figure 3.B shows the schematic of the exterior lens, i.e., farthest from the transmit fibers. The two lenses work together to provide collimation of the light emitted from the transmit fibers into the environment and to focus the target-reflected light to the detectors.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



7. The eight fiber lasers in the Spider design were fiber MOPA lasers. MOPA stands for master oscillator power amplifier and refers to a configuration consisting of a master laser (also known as a seed laser) that generates a low power version of the desired pulse signal and an optical amplifier to boost the output power of this pulse signal. A fiber MOPA laser refers to a MOPA laser that uses a fiber amplifier. The Spider design included [REDACTED] for its fiber lasers to obtain the power levels necessary for use as emitters in a LiDAR sensor. This is a well-known technique to amplify the output power of a fiber laser.<sup>1</sup> The Spider design included [REDACTED], which is a commercially available fiber purchased from iXBlue.<sup>2</sup> Figure 4 below is a screenshot of iXBlue's website,

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., RP Photonics, *Fiber Amplifiers*, [https://www.rp-photonics.com/tutorial\\_fiber\\_amplifiers10.html](https://www.rp-photonics.com/tutorial_fiber_amplifiers10.html); Grzegorz Sobon et al., *Controlling the 1  $\mu$ m spontaneous emission in Er/Yb co-doped fiber amplifiers*, 19 Optics Express 19106 (2011), available at [https://www.osapublishing.org/DirectPDFAccess/FBA42477-936E-A370-B8E0FD26AF56013C\\_222547/oe-19-20-19104.pdf?da=1&id=222547&seq=0&mobile=no](https://www.osapublishing.org/DirectPDFAccess/FBA42477-936E-A370-B8E0FD26AF56013C_222547/oe-19-20-19104.pdf?da=1&id=222547&seq=0&mobile=no); Clémence Jollivet et al., *Specialty Fiber: Multiple Applications Benefit from Advances in High-Performance Er:Yb Co-Doped Double-Clad Fiber*, Laser Focus World (Sept. 14, 2016), <http://www.laserfocusworld.com/articles/print/volume-52/issue-09/features/specialty-fiber-multiple-applications-benefit-from-advances-in-high-performance-er-yb-co-doped-double-clad-fiber.html>.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., iXBlue, *Specialty Fibers: Active Fibers: Erbium / Ytterbium Double Clad Doped Fibers*, <https://photonics.ixblue.com/products-list-detail/erbium-ytterbium-double-clad-doped-fibers>; Newport, *Erbium & Ytterbium Co-Doped Fibers*, <https://www.newport.com/f/erbium-&-ytterbium-doped-fibers>; Fibercore, *Erbium Doped Fiber IsoGain™*, <http://fibercore.com/product/erbium-doped-fiber-isogain>.

which discloses that its Erbium Ytterbium double clad doped fiber is an ideal component for a “high power laser” (i.e., “1550 nm band”) and lists “LIDAR” as an intended application for this fiber.



8. As mentioned above, we abandoned the Spider project before we completed a prototype device. Spider was designed to have eight optical cavities, but we had only built one optical cavity for testing purposes, and never mounted that single test optical cavity onto the rotating base. For the one test optical cavity that we built, we were unable to place the transmit fibers accurately enough to align the eight transmit fibers to the eight photodetectors.

9. My team worked on the Spider project until late October 2016. Spider proved to be undesirable and was abandoned because of the complexities of the design, the anticipated difficulty of scaling the manufacturing of the design, and its large size, heavy weight, and high power requirement. As designed, Spider would likely have weighed approximately 165 pounds, which would have been about six times heavier than a Velodyne HDL-64. While the large size and heavy weight of the Spider design was less of a consideration for a semi-truck, the weight of Spider design, along with the additional components that would have been required to mount a



**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY**

1 completed Spider onto the roof of a passenger vehicle, would have likely exceeded the rated  
2 payload of the roof of a Volvo XC90 (220 pounds).

3 10. The LiDAR team's decision to abandon Spider and pivot to Fuji was made by the  
4 engineering team and was based on design considerations. When I met Scott Boehmke and Eric  
5 Meyhofer in October 2016 to discuss my team's work on Spider, we concluded that the Spider  
6 design would be undesirable for use in Uber's vehicles because of the reasons explained above  
7 (i.e., the complexity of the design, anticipated difficulty with scaling, and its large size, heavy  
8 weight, and high power requirement). Anthony Levandowski did not direct the LiDAR team to  
9 pivot from Spider to Fuji, but instead deferred to the engineers on the LiDAR team's  
10 recommendation and judgment to pursue a bistatic, diode-based LiDAR design. Exhibit A,  
11 attached hereto, is an email exchange between Eric Meyhofer, Scott Boehmke, Dan Gruver, and  
12 me regarding the feasibility of pivoting from [REDACTED] (i.e., Spider) to [REDACTED] (i.e., a new diode-based  
13 design, which became Fuji).<sup>3</sup> In this email, Eric Meyhofer stated that he had spoken with  
14 Anthony and had promised Anthony that the team would [REDACTED]  
15 [REDACTED] As I had explained during my deposition, I did not even know if  
16 Anthony was aware that Eric, Scott and I had already committed to pivoting from Spider to Fuji  
17 when I announced the pivot to the rest of the LiDAR team on October 28, 2016 in San Francisco.<sup>4</sup>  
18 The LiDAR team's decision to abandon the Spider project to work on Fuji was based on the  
19 aforementioned design considerations and was not at the instructions of Uber's legal team or due  
20 to any legal issues.

### 21 **The Fuji Device**


22 11. As I explained in my earlier declaration, Fuji is a LiDAR sensor having two  
23 optical cavities each with 32 channels oriented at different vertical angles to capture the field of  
24 view necessary for applications in self-driving cars. Specifically, Fuji has a total vertical field of  
25

26 <sup>3</sup> A true and correct copy of this document was provided to Waymo as UBER00008592 and was  
27 introduced and designated by Waymo as Exhibit 62 in my April 18, 2017 deposition in this case.

28 <sup>4</sup> See Haslim Dep. 88:6-21, April 18, 2017. A true and correct excerpt of this section of my  
deposition is attached as Exhibit B to this declaration.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

view of 30.23 degrees, from -22.0 degrees to 8.23 degrees. Each cavity has a separate transmit lens and receive lens. The transmit lens has a focal length of 150 mm. Figures 5.A and 5.B, below, are a true and correct photos of Fuji as of March 2017. As Figures 5.A and 5.B show, the two optical cavities are mounted on a rotating base that spins the optical cavities to capture a 360 degree horizontal field of view. The rotating base includes a stationary portion that will couple to the roof of a vehicle. As I had also stated in my earlier declaration, no Fuji device has ever been mounted on any vehicle for testing. Above the optical cavities is the timing board, which measures the time between transmitted pulses and received target-reflected pulses. The yellow cable in the Figures 5.A. and 5.B is a commercially available [REDACTED]



12. There are [REDACTED] transmit printed circuit boards (PCBs) within each cavity in Fuji. Each channel represents light from a single laser diode, and the 32 laser diodes are distributed over [REDACTED]. As I had explained in my prior declaration, I came up with the idea of

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Princetel, *FORJ: Miniature fiber rotary joints (MicroJx Series)*, [http://princetel.com/forj\\_mjx.asp](http://princetel.com/forj_mjx.asp).



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1 distributing the 32 laser diodes across [REDACTED] through an iterative approach. I  
2 initially wanted to fit all 32 laser diodes on a single PCB because that would simplify the process  
3 of aligning the laser diodes to the detectors. As stated in my October 28, 2016 email to Scott  
4 Boehmke, however, I realized that having two cavities and mounting 32 laser diodes on a single  
5 PCB per cavity did not provide enough spacing between the laser diodes' circuits and associated  
6 components and had suggested to Scott that we would need to [REDACTED] for each  
7 of the two cavities.<sup>6</sup>

8 13. I understand that in its reply brief, Waymo contends that there is no other evidence  
9 of Uber's independent development of Fuji's board and diode arrangement. This is not true.  
10 Figure 10 is a true and correct excerpt from Scott's November 2016 beam spacing and angles  
11 summary<sup>7</sup> showing the assumptions used in the calculations of beam spacing for a LiDAR sensor  
12 designed to be mounted on a vehicle traveling at 30 mph.




Figure 6

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>6</sup> A true and correct copy of this document was previously attached as Exhibit A to my previous  
26 declaration. This document was also introduced and designated by Waymo as Exhibit 58 during  
27 my April 18 deposition.

28 <sup>7</sup> A true and correct copy of this document was previously attached as Exhibit E to my prior  
declaration. This document was also introduced and designated by Waymo as Exhibit 56 during  
my April 18 deposition.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

1 The document excerpted above clearly shows that we independently came up with the idea to use  
2 [REDACTED] and in two optical cavities [REDACTED] Scott created this  
3 document after the LiDAR team realized that 32 laser diodes would need to be distributed across  
4 [REDACTED] boards to provide sufficient spacing. I communicated this to Scott, who then calculated  
5 beam spacing and angles for Fuji using the assumptions of distributed 64 beams in two cavities  
6 with [REDACTED] boards per cavity, which is reflected in the above document.

7 14. As I mentioned in my earlier declaration, Fuji uses commercially available edge-  
8 emitting laser diodes. A known technique of mounting laser diodes onto PCBs is to die attach  
9 and wire bond the laser diodes [REDACTED] that are integrated into the PCBs. As I explained in  
10 my earlier declaration, the [REDACTED] transmit PCBs are mounted onto the transmit block using two  
11 dowel pins that go through the mounting holes in each PCB. I understand that Waymo alleges in  
12 its reply brief that Uber uses both dowel pins and fiducials to position laser diodes. This is  
13 incorrect. As I had stated in my earlier declaration and again at my deposition, the mounting  
14 holes and dowel pins in Fuji are not used as reference points from which we position the laser  
15 diodes on any of the [REDACTED] transmit boards.<sup>8</sup>

16 15. As I mentioned in my earlier declaration, Fuji uses commercially available laser  
17 diodes that emit light with a wavelength of approximately 905 nm. It is publicly well known that  
18 a fast axis collimating (“FAC”) lens can be used to pre-collimate the light emitted from a laser  
19 diode in order to focus and redirect the light towards a transmit lens.<sup>9</sup> I understand that although  
20 Waymo has not raised any arguments in its opening or reply briefs about Uber’s FAC lens, I also  
21 understand that Waymo’s expert has discussed this commonly used component in his reply  
22 declaration. Figure 12.A illustrates a true and accurate 3-D rendering of the FAC lens used in  
23 Fuji. [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]. Figure 12.B illustrates a  
25

26 <sup>8</sup> See Haslim Dep. 64:24-65:10. A true and correct excerpt of this section of my declaration is  
attached as Exhibit B to this declaration.

27 <sup>9</sup> See Hamamatsu, *FAC Lens (Fast-Axis Collimating Lens) J10919 Series*, available at  
28 [https://www.hamamatsu.com/resources/pdf/etd/J10919\\_TOTH1005E.pdf](https://www.hamamatsu.com/resources/pdf/etd/J10919_TOTH1005E.pdf).

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

1 true and accurate Zemax simulation of the beam output from Fuji’s FAC lens. As shown in  
 2 Figure 12.B, the FAC lens pre-collimates the light emitted from the laser diode such that [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED]  
 7 [REDACTED]  
 8 [REDACTED]  
 9 [REDACTED]

Figure 7.A

Figure 7.B

### Beam Spacing in Fuji


12 16. I understand that in its reply brief, Waymo contends that there is no evidence to  
 13 support the fact that Uber independently developed Fuji, and its transmit boards, based on the  
 14 work Uber had started in late October 2016. As I discussed in my earlier declaration, the position  
 15 and orientation of the laser diodes in Fuji is based on the custom beam spacing and angle  
 16 summary provided by Scott Boehmke in November 2016, which I included as Exhibit E in my  
 17 earlier declaration. This summary provided the required beam angles for a 64 channel LiDAR  
 18 with two cavities and [REDACTED] boards per cavity, on a vehicle traveling at 30 mph, 35 mph, 40 mph,  
 19 and 45 mph. As I had previously explained, the current Fuji design is based on the beam angles  
 20 for a vehicle traveling up to approximately 35mph. My team imported the angles in this summary  
 21 into Zemax, a commonly known ray tracing simulation software program, to determine the  
 22 resultant emitting points of the laser diodes. This data was then exported into SolidWorks CAD  
 23 software as the basis for the initial optical cavity designs and transmit PCB designs.<sup>10</sup>

24 17. Figure 8.A is a true and correct annotated excerpt of the initial Fuji beam angles,  
 25 and the difference or “delta” between each angle, for what I had previously referred to in my  
 26

27 <sup>10</sup> True and correct CAD drawings of the optical cavity and transmit PCBs are disclosed as  
 28 Figures 2A-B and 6A-F in my original declaration.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY


1 earlier declaration as the “medium-range cavity,” which contains transmit boards A-C and has a  
 2 tilt of negative 12 degrees. Figure 8.B is a true and correct annotated excerpt of the initial Fuji  
 3 beam angles, and the deltas between each angle, for what I had previously referred to in my  
 4 earlier declaration as the “long-range cavity” that had no tilt. As shown in the color annotations  
 5 in Figures 13.A and 13.B, the 32 channels in each cavity are distributed in a pattern such that one  
 6 in every [REDACTED] channels is on the same PCB ([REDACTED])



23  
 24 Below is a chart comparing the initial beam angles for the “medium-range” cavity provided by  
 25 Scott in his November 2016 document (illustrated above in annotated Figure 13.A) with the  
 26 current angular orientation of the diodes in transmit boards [REDACTED] previously provided in Exhibit B  
 27 of my earlier declaration. Referring to transmit boards [REDACTED] the theta represents the downwards  
 28 angular orientation of the diodes relative to the central axis through the transmit board. Because


HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

1 there is an additional downwards tilt of 12 degrees in the “medium-ranged” cavity containing  
2 transmit boards [REDACTED] the theta for transmit boards [REDACTED] must also be adjusted by 12 degrees. For  
3 example, [REDACTED]  
4 [REDACTED]. As the chart below confirms, there is no more than a 0.06  
5 degree difference between initial Fuji beam angles in the November 16 document provided by  
6 Scott and the beam angles in the transmit boards in Fuji’s “medium-range” cavity.



14 18. Below is a chart comparing the initial beam angles for the “long-range” cavity  
15 provided by Scott in his November 2016 document (illustrated above in annotated Figure 13.B)  
16 with the angular orientation of the diodes in transmit boards [REDACTED] previously provided in Exhibit  
17 E of my earlier declaration. Referring to transmit boards [REDACTED], the theta represents the angular  
18 orientation of the diodes relative to the central axis through the transmit board. Originally, Scott  
19 had provided diode angles which contemplated overlapping one beam in the long-range cavity  
20 with one beam in the medium-range cavity to compensate for any gaps in beam spacing that  
21 might arise due to manufacturing tolerances. I, however, believed that we could control the  
22 manufacturing tolerances such that we would not have to overlap beams (and effectively waste an  
23 entire channel), and accordingly shifted his proposed beam spacing. As the shown in the chart  
24 below, there is a consistent 0.18 to 0.24 degree shift between Scott’s initial proposed beam angles  
25 and the beam angles in the transmit boards in Fuji’s “long-range” cavity.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



### Comparison between Spider and Fuji

19. Below is a comparison of design specifications of the proposed Spider design and the Fuji device.

	Spider	Fuji
<b>Type of Laser</b>	Fiber lasers	Direct diode lasers
<b># of Channels</b>	64	64
<b># of Cavities</b>	8	2
<b># of transmit PCBs per cavity</b>	None	
<b># &amp; Type of Transmit and Receive Lens</b>	Total: 16 lenses total Per cavity: 2 lens that both transmit and receive	Total: 4 Per cavity: 1 lens for transmit and 1 lens for receive <sup>11</sup>
<b>Pre-collimation Lens (i.e. FAC lens)</b>	None	64 FAC lenses, one per diode
<b># &amp; Type of Mirrors</b>	One flat mirror with a hole	None
<b>Weight</b>	75 kg (approximately 165 lbs)	Maximum of 20 kg (approximately 44 lbs)
<b>Beams or Points per second</b>	3.2 million	1.5 million

### Inspection of Spider Components

20. On Friday, April 14, 2017 and Monday, April 17, 2017, I oversaw the collection of existing components associated with the abandoned Spider project for Waymo's inspection on Wednesday, April 19, 2017. Esther Kim Chang of Morrison Foerster and Aaron Bergstrom of Uber assisted in this process.

<sup>11</sup> Not including the field flattening lens in the receive compartment within a cavity.



23. One optical cavity for testing purposes associated with the Spider project was located in a plastic bin near the storage locker on the ground floor of Otto's former offices at 737 Harrison Street.

  
James Haslim